

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 56-73 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 56-72 and are currently rejected. Claims 15 and 73 are allowed. Claim 23 is objected to. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17 and 73 are currently amended. Claims 10, 14, 22 and 61-72 have been cancelled in this response (in total, claims 3, 9-10, 14, 18, 21-55, and 61-72 have been cancelled during the course of prosecution). In light of the remarks herein, reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15-17, 19-20, 56-60 and 73 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant's gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's determination that claims 15 and 73 are allowed and that claim 23 is allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Amendments to the Claims

While Applicants believe that the previously presented claims are patentable over all of the art cited in the Office Action, as well as all other references submitted by Applicants, the claims have nonetheless been amended as follows in order to expedite the allowance of the claims. The amendments are, therefore, made without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original scope of the claims as provided prior to the cancellation or amendment of the claims, such as through continuation practice.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 23, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12-13 and 16-17 have been amended to change their dependency from claim 1 to claim 73. Support for these amendments are found throughout the specification.

Claim 73 has been amended to clarify that the device may have more than one protuberance and more than one skin contacting surface. Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14, 16, 19, 20, 56, 61-63, 65, 68-70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,273,884. Claims 2, 10, 12, 17, 22, 57-60, 64, 66-67, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various references. Applicants traverse these rejections and reserve their rights to address the rejections in future prosecution. However, Applicants submit that the amendments to the specification, which are directed to the allowed and allowable subject matter, render the present rejections moot at this time.

Claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 16-17, 19-20 and 56-60 are patentable for at least the reasons that Claims 1, 15 and 73, from which each respectively depends, are patentable. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15-17, 19-20, 56-60 and 73 are in order for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration is respectfully requested for all the reasons set forth above. In the event that the Examiner deems that the amendments and remarks do not overcome the stated grounds for rejection, the Applicants kindly request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

NUTTER McCLENNEN & FISH LLP

Date: June 23, 2008



Thomas J. Engelenner
Registration No.: 28,711
Attorney for Applicants
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210-2604
Tel: (617) 439-2948
Fax: (617) 310-9948